

Precision Tests of the Standard Model*

Paul Langacker

*Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104*

February 1, 2008, UPR-0555T

Abstract

The implications of recent precision Z -pole, W mass, and weak neutral current data for testing the standard electroweak model, constraining the t quark and Higgs masses, $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, and grand unification are discussed. A fit to all data yields $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) = 0.2328 \pm 0.0007$ ($\overline{\text{MS}}$) or $\sin^2 \theta_W \equiv 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2 = 0.2267 \pm 0.0024$ (on-shell), where the uncertainties are mainly from m_t . In the standard model one predicts $m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19+15}$ GeV, where the central value assumes $M_H = 300$ GeV and the second uncertainty is for $M_H \rightarrow 60$ GeV (–) or 1 TeV (+). In the minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model (MSSM) one predicts $m_t = 134_{-28}^{+23} \pm 5$ GeV, where the difference is due the light Higgs scalar expected in the MSSM. There is no significant constraint on M_H until m_t is known independently.

1 Experimental Results

Recent high precision measurements of Z pole observables by the ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, and OPAL [1, 2, 3] collaborations at LEP and SLD at the SLC [4], the W mass by CDF [5] and UA2 [6], atomic parity violation in cesium [7, 8], neutrino-electron scattering by CHARM II [9], and other weak neutral current observables [10, 11], as well as the direct lower bounds $m_t > 91$ GeV (CDF [12]) and $M_H > 60$ GeV (LEP average [13]) and the determination $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ from Z -pole and low-energy observables [14] allow precise tests of the standard electroweak model and searches for certain types of new physics. In this talk, which is an update of previously presented analyses [15]–[19], I review the status of the standard model tests and parameters, and the coupling constant predictions in ordinary and supersymmetric grand unified theories (GUTs).

*Lectures presented at *TASI-92*, Boulder, June 1992.

Many of the recent results are summarized in Table 1. The LEP results are averages by D. Schaile of the four LEP experiments as of March, 1993 [3], which includes nearly final results for the 1991 LEP run and contains a proper treatment of common systematic errors [2]. M_Z is now known to the incredible precision of better than 0.01%. This was achieved by the method of resonant depolarization, in which the (calculable) energies at which the small ($\sim 10\%$) transverse polarization of the leptons is destroyed by an oscillating B field was used to calibrate the energy of the LEP beams. The method is so precise that the tidal effects of the moon, which cause the size of the LEP ring to change by a few parts in 10^8 and thus change the energy by ~ 8 MeV, had to be measured and corrected for¹. $\Gamma_Z, \Gamma_{\bar{l}l}, \Gamma_{had}, \Gamma_{b\bar{b}},$ and Γ_{inv} refer respectively to the total, leptonic (average of e, μ, τ), hadronic, $b\bar{b}$, and invisible Z widths; $R \equiv \Gamma_{had}/\Gamma_{\bar{l}l}$; $\sigma_p^h = 12\pi\Gamma_{e\bar{e}}\Gamma_{had}/M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2$ is the hadronic cross section on the pole; and $N_\nu \equiv \Gamma_{inv}/\Gamma_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ is the number of light neutrino flavors. A number of asymmetries have also been measured. $A_{FB}(f)$ is the forward-backward asymmetry for $e^+e^- \rightarrow f\bar{f}$; $A_{pol}(\tau)$ is the polarization of a final τ (L is positive), while $A_e(P_\tau)$ is essentially the forward-backward asymmetry in the polarization; A_{LR} is the polarization asymmetry, which has recently been measured for the first time by the SLD collaboration at the SLC [4]. All of the asymmetries are Born contributions, from which various QED, QCD, interference, and box contributions have been removed by the experimenters. Finally, $\bar{g}_A, \bar{g}_V$ are effective Born couplings, related, for example, to $\Gamma_{\bar{l}l}$ and $A_{FB}(\mu)$ by²

$$\Gamma_{\bar{l}l} = \frac{G_F M_Z^3}{6\sqrt{2}\pi}(\bar{g}_A^2 + \bar{g}_V^2) \quad A_{FB}(\mu) = \frac{3 \bar{g}_V^2 \bar{g}_A^2}{(\bar{g}_V^2 + \bar{g}_A^2)^2}. \quad (1)$$

Similarly,

$$A_{LR} = \frac{2 \bar{g}_V \bar{g}_A}{\bar{g}_V^2 + \bar{g}_A^2}, \quad (2)$$

with the same expression for $A_{pol}(\tau)$ and $A_e(P_\tau)$.

Of the Z -pole observables only $M_Z, \Gamma_Z, R, \sigma_p^h, \Gamma_{b\bar{b}}, A_{FB}(\mu), A_{pol}(\tau), A_e(P_\tau), A_{FB}(b)$ (which is corrected for $b\bar{b}$ oscillations), $A_{FB}(c)$, and A_{LR} are used in the analysis. Γ_Z, R , and σ_p^h are used rather than the more physically transparent $\Gamma_Z, \Gamma_{\bar{l}l}$, and Γ_{had} because the former are closer to what is actually measured and are relatively weakly correlated. (The combined LEP values [3] for the correlations are used.) $\bar{s}_W^2 (A_{FB}(q))$, which is the effective weak angle obtained from the charge asymmetry in hadronic decays, is not used because the results have only been presented assuming the validity of the standard model. The other LEP observables are not independent but are displayed for completeness.

Recent measurements of the W mass and weak neutral current data are also displayed in Table 1. $Q_W(Cs)$ is the effective charge of the parity-violating interaction

¹This is the first experiment in which all four interactions were important simultaneously!

²I assume lepton universality, throughout. This is strongly supported by the LEP data.

Quantity	Value	standard model
M_Z (GeV)	91.187 ± 0.007	input
Γ_Z (GeV)	2.491 ± 0.007	$2.490 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.005 \pm [0.006]$
$R = \Gamma_{had}/\Gamma_{l\bar{l}}$	20.87 ± 0.07	$20.78 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01 \pm [0.07]$
$\sigma_p^h(nb)$	41.33 ± 0.18	$41.42 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01 \pm [0.06]$
$\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ (MeV)	373 ± 9	$375.9 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.5 \pm [1.3]$
$A_{FB}(\mu)$	0.0152 ± 0.0027	$0.0141 \pm 0.0005 \pm 0.0010$
$A_{pol}(\tau)$	0.140 ± 0.018	$0.137 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.005$
$A_e(P_\tau)$	0.134 ± 0.030	$0.137 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.005$
$A_{FB}(b)$	0.093 ± 0.012	$0.096 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.003$
$A_{FB}(c)$	0.072 ± 0.027	$0.068 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.003$
A_{LR}	0.100 ± 0.044	$0.137 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.005$
$\Gamma_{l\bar{l}}$ (MeV)	83.43 ± 0.29	$83.66 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.13$
Γ_{had} (MeV)	1741.2 ± 6.6	$1739 \pm 1 \pm 4 \pm [6]$
Γ_{inv} (MeV)	499.5 ± 5.6	$500.4 \pm 0.1 \pm 0.9$
N_ν	3.004 ± 0.035	3
$\bar{g}_A$	-0.4999 ± 0.0009	-0.5
$\bar{g}_V$	-0.0351 ± 0.0025	$-0.0344 \pm 0.0006 \pm 0.0013$
$\bar{s}_W^2(A_{FB}(q))$	0.2329 ± 0.0031	$0.2328 \pm 0.0003 \pm 0.0007 \pm ?$
M_W (GeV)	79.91 ± 0.39	$80.18 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.13$
M_W/M_Z	0.8813 ± 0.0041	$0.8793 \pm 0.0002 \pm 0.0014$
$Q_W(Cs)$	$-71.04 \pm 1.58 \pm [0.88]$	$-73.20 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.02$
$g_A^e(\nu e \rightarrow \nu e)$	-0.503 ± 0.017	$-0.505 \pm 0 \pm 0.001$
$g_V^e(\nu e \rightarrow \nu e)$	-0.025 ± 0.020	$-0.036 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.001$
$\sin^2 \theta_W$	$0.2242 \pm 0.0042 \pm [0.0047]$	$0.2269 \pm 0.0003 \pm 0.0025$

Table 1: Experimental values for LEP [1, 2, 3] and SLC [4] observables, M_W [5], M_W/M_Z [6], the weak charge in cesium Q_W [7, 8], the parameters $g_{V,A}^e$ relevant to $\nu_\mu e$ scattering from CHARM II [9], and $\sin^2 \theta_W \equiv 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ from CCFR [10], compared with the standard model predictions for $M_Z = 91.187 \pm 0.007$ GeV, $m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19}$ GeV, and $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1 \text{ TeV}$. Only the first eleven Z -pole observables are independent. The ? for the $\bar{s}_W^2(A_{FB}(q))$ prediction refers to the scheme dependence. The two errors for $Q_W(Cs)$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ are experimental and theoretical (in brackets). The first error in the predictions is from the uncertainties in M_Z and Δr , the second is from m_t and M_H , and the third (in brackets) is the theoretical QCD uncertainty for $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ [14]. The older neutral current quantities described in [11] are also used in the analysis.

Quantity	Experiment	SM	Topless	Mirror	Vector
$\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ (MeV)	373 ± 9	376	24	376	728
$A_{FB}(b)$	0.093 ± 0.012	0.096	0	-0.096	0

Table 2: Predictions of the standard model (SM), topless models, a mirror model with $(t\ b)_R$ in a doublet, and a vector model with left and right-handed doublets, for $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ and $A_{FB}(b)$, compared with the experimental values.

in cesium [7], while $g_{V,A}^e$ are the coefficients of the vector and axial electron currents in the effective four-fermi interaction for $(\bar{\nu}_\mu e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu e)$ as obtained by CHARM II [9]. The preliminary value of the on-shell weak angle $\sin^2 \theta_W \equiv 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2 = 0.2242 \pm 0.0042 \pm [0.0047]$ obtained from deep inelastic neutrino scattering from CCFR [10] at Fermilab is in reasonable agreement with the earlier CERN values $0.228 \pm 0.005 \pm [0.005]$ [20], and $0.236 \pm 0.005 \pm [0.005]$ [21], though the central value is somewhat lower. The errors in brackets are theoretical. They are dominated by the c -quark threshold in the charged current scattering used to normalize the neutral current process, and are strongly correlated between the experiments. Older neutral current results, included in the analysis, are described in [11].

The standard model predictions for each quantity other than M_Z are also shown. These are computed using $M_Z = 91.187 \pm 0.007$ GeV as input, using the range of m_t determined from the global fit and $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1 \text{ TeV}$. The agreement is excellent.

The b observables $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ and $A_{FB}(b)$ are especially important because the predictions depend on the SU_2 assignments of the b . In Table 2 the experimental values are compared with topless models and other alternatives with $V + A$ currents. It is seen that the data uniquely picks out the standard model from these alternatives [22]. This conclusion is strengthened by a recent detailed analysis by Schaile and Zerwas [23] of LEP and lower energy data, which yields

$$t_{3L}(b) = -0.490_{-0.012}^{+0.015} \quad t_{3R}(b) = -0.028 \pm 0.056 \quad (3)$$

for the third component of the weak isospin of the $b_{L,R}$, respectively, in agreement with the standard model expectations of $-1/2$ and $0 - i.e.$, topless models are excluded and the b_L must be in a weak doublet with the t_L .

2 Standard Model Tests and m_t

Results will be presented in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ [24] and on-shell [25] schemes. I use the radiative corrections calculated by Degrossi *et al.* [26] for the W and Z masses, those of Hollik [27] for the Z widths, and generalized Born expressions for the Born contributions to the asymmetries. The latter are obtained from the data, *e.g.*, by using the program

ZFITTER [28]. The calculations in [26]-[28] are in excellent agreement with each other and with those in [29]. Radiative corrections to low energy neutral current processes are described in [11].

In the standard model

$$\begin{aligned} M_Z^2 &= \frac{A_0^2}{\hat{\rho}\hat{c}^2\hat{s}^2(1-\Delta\hat{r}_W)} = \frac{A_0^2}{c^2s^2(1-\Delta r)} \\ M_W^2 &= \hat{\rho}\hat{c}^2M_Z^2 = c^2M_Z^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $A_0^2 = \pi\alpha/\sqrt{2}G_F = (37.2803 \text{ GeV})^2$, $\hat{s}^2 \equiv \sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ refers to the weak angle in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme [24], $s^2 \equiv \sin^2\theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ refers to the on-shell scheme [25], $\hat{c}^2 \equiv 1 - \hat{s}^2$, and $c^2 \equiv 1 - s^2$; $\Delta\hat{r}_W$, $\hat{\rho} - 1$, and Δr are radiative correction parameters. As is well known [30], $\hat{\rho} \sim 1 + \Delta\rho_t$, where

$$\Delta\rho_t = \frac{3G_F m_t^2}{8\sqrt{2}\pi^2} \simeq 0.0031 \left(\frac{m_t}{100\text{GeV}} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

has a strong m_t dependence, while $\Delta r \simeq \Delta r_0 - \Delta\rho_t/\tan^2\theta_W$ is even more sensitive. $\Delta\hat{r}_W \sim \Delta r_0 \sim 1 - \alpha/\alpha(M_Z) \sim 0.07$ has no quadratic m_t dependence. There is additional logarithmic dependence on m_t and M_H in $\hat{\rho}$, $\Delta\hat{r}_W$, and Δr , as well as $O(\alpha)$ effects associated with low energy physics. These effects are important and are fully incorporated in the analysis, but will not be displayed here.

Gluonic corrections to $\Delta\rho_t$ of order $-\alpha\alpha_s m_t^2/M_Z^2$ can be important for large m_t [31, 32]. The leading perturbative term is [31] $-2\alpha_s(m_t)(\pi^2 + 3)/9\pi \sim -0.10$ times the expression in (5). These corrections, which increase the predicted value of m_t by about 5%, are included in the analysis³.

The most accurate determination of $\sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ and $\sin^2\theta_W$ are from $M_Z = 91.187 \pm 0.007 \text{ GeV}$. The values are shown in Table 3 for $m_t = 100$ and 200 GeV and $M_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$, and also for the global best fit range for m_t and M_H . It is apparent that the extracted value of $\sin^2\theta_W$ depends strongly on m_t , while $\sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ is considerably less sensitive due to the smaller coefficient of the quadratic m_t term in $\hat{\rho}$ than in Δr . For fixed m_t and M_H the uncertainty of ± 0.0003 in $\sin^2\theta_W$ has two components: the experimental error from ΔM_Z is only ± 0.0001 , while the theoretical error (from the uncertainty of ± 0.0009 in Δr from low energy hadronic contributions) is larger, ± 0.0003 . The $\pm 1\sigma$ limits on $\sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ as a function of m_t are shown in Figure 1.

The ratio $M_W/M_Z = 0.8813 \pm 0.0041$ determined by UA2 [6] and $M_W = 79.91 \pm 0.39 \text{ GeV}$ from CDF [5] determine the values of $\sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ shown in Table 4. From Figure 1 it is apparent that M_Z , M_W , and M_W/M_Z together imply an upper limit of

³These terms were omitted from previous analyses (e.g., [15]), because of uncertainties in both the magnitude and sign of important nonperturbative effects [32]. However, a careful new analysis [33] indicates that the perturbative estimate is an excellent approximation. A future global analysis will include small additional corrections.

m_t (GeV)	$\sin^2 \theta_W$	$\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$
100	0.2322 ± 0.0003	0.2340 ± 0.0003
200	0.2204 ± 0.0003	0.2311 ± 0.0003
150^{+19}_{-24}	0.2269 ± 0.0025	0.2328 ± 0.0007

Table 3: Values of $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ and $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ obtained from $M_Z = 91.187 \pm 0.007$ GeV, assuming $(m_t, M_H) = (100, 300)$ and $(200, 300)$ GeV. In the last row $m_t = 150^{+19}_{-24}$ GeV (obtained from the global fit to all data) and $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1000 \text{ GeV}$.

Figure 1: One σ uncertainty in $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ as a function of m_t for $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ determined from various inputs for $M_H = 300$ GeV. The direct lower limit $m_t > 91$ GeV and the 90% CL fit to all data are also shown.

Data	$\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ $m_t = 100$	$m_t = 200$	$m_t = 150^{+19}_{-24}$
M_Z	0.2340 ± 0.0003	0.2311 ± 0.0003	0.2328 ± 0.0007
$M_W, \frac{M_W}{M_Z}$	0.2331 ± 0.0022	0.2345 ± 0.0022	0.2339 ± 0.0022
Γ_Z, R, σ_p^h	0.2333 ± 0.0006	0.2319 ± 0.0006	0.2327 ± 0.0006
Γ_Z	0.2332 ± 0.0006	0.2320 ± 0.0006	0.2327 ± 0.0007
$\Gamma_{\bar{l}l}$	0.2340 ± 0.0007	0.2326 ± 0.0007	0.2333 ± 0.0008
$\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$	0.236 ± 0.004	0.232 ± 0.004	0.234 ± 0.004
Γ_Z/M_Z	0.2329 ± 0.0009	0.2323 ± 0.0009	0.2326 ± 0.0009
$\Gamma_{\bar{l}l}/M_Z$	0.2341 ± 0.0010	0.2332 ± 0.0010	0.2336 ± 0.0010
Γ_Z/M_Z^3	0.230 ± 0.003	0.236 ± 0.003	0.232 ± 0.004
$\Gamma_{\bar{l}l}/M_Z^3, R$	0.231 ± 0.004	0.234 ± 0.003	0.232 ± 0.004
$A_{FB}(\mu)$	0.232 ± 0.002	0.232 ± 0.002	0.232 ± 0.002
$A_{pol}(\tau)$	0.232 ± 0.002	0.232 ± 0.002	0.232 ± 0.002
$A_{FB}(b)$	0.233 ± 0.002	0.233 ± 0.002	0.233 ± 0.002
A_{LR}	0.238 ± 0.006	0.238 ± 0.006	0.238 ± 0.006
$\nu N \rightarrow \nu X$	0.233 ± 0.005	0.238 ± 0.005	0.235 ± 0.005
$\nu p \rightarrow \nu p$	0.212 ± 0.032	0.212 ± 0.031	0.212 ± 0.032
$\nu_\mu e \rightarrow \nu_\mu e$	0.232 ± 0.009	0.231 ± 0.009	0.232 ± 0.009
$e^{\uparrow\downarrow} D \rightarrow eX$	0.222 ± 0.018	0.223 ± 0.018	0.222 ± 0.018
atomic parity	0.224 ± 0.008	0.221 ± 0.008	0.223 ± 0.008
All	0.2337 ± 0.0003	0.2314 ± 0.0003	0.2328 ± 0.0007

Table 4: Values of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ obtained from various inputs, for $(m_t, M_H) = (100, 300)$ and $(200, 300)$ GeV. In the last column $m_t = 150^{+19+15}_{-24-20}$ GeV, from the global fit, correlated with $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1000 \text{ GeV}$. For $\nu N \rightarrow \nu X$ the uncertainty includes 0.003 (experiment) and 0.005 (theory). For atomic parity, the experimental and theoretical components of the error are 0.007 and 0.004 respectively.

$O(200 \text{ GeV})$ on m_t . A simultaneous fit of M_Z , M_W , and M_W/M_Z to $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$, and m_t yields $m_t = 145^{+42}_{-49} \pm 16 \text{ GeV}$, where the second uncertainty is from M_H in the range 60-1000 GeV, with a central value of 300 GeV. The 90(95)% CL upper limits on m_t are 211 (223) GeV (Table 5). The upper limits are for $M_H = 1000 \text{ GeV}$, which gives the weakest constraint. The value of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$, including the uncertainties from m_t and M_H , is also given in Table 5.

The partial width for $\Gamma \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ is given by [27, 29],

$$\Gamma_{f\bar{f}} = \frac{C_f \hat{\rho} G_F M_Z^3}{6\sqrt{2}\pi} (|a_f|^2 + |v_f|^2). \quad (6)$$

The axial and vector couplings are

$$a_f = t_{3L}(f) = \pm \frac{1}{2}$$

data	$\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$	m_t (GeV)	m_t^{max} (GeV)
$M_Z, M_W, M_W/M_Z$	0.2329 ± 0.0014	$145_{-49}^{+42} \pm 16$	211(223)
Z-POLE	0.2328 ± 0.0008	$150 \pm 27 \pm 18$	198 (206)
Z-POLE + $M_W, M_W/M_Z$	0.2328 ± 0.0007	$150_{-26}^{+21} \pm 18$	193(200)
$M_Z, \nu N$	$0.2333_{-0.0016}^{+0.0011}$	$132_{-40}^{+54} \pm 19$	210 (223)
All	0.2328 ± 0.0007	$150_{-24}^{+19+15} \pm 20$	190 (197)

Table 5: Values of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ and m_t obtained for various data sets. Z-POLE refers to the first 11 constraints in Table 1 (with correlations). The $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ error includes m_t and M_H . The first error for m_t includes experimental and theoretical uncertainties for $M_H = 300$ GeV. The second error is the variation for $M_H \rightarrow 60$ GeV (−) and $M_H \rightarrow 1000$ GeV (+). The last column lists the upper limits on m_t at 90 (95)% CL for $M_H = 1000$ GeV, which gives the weakest upper limit. The direct CDF constraint $m_t > 91$ GeV is included.

$$v_f = t_{3L}(f) - 2 \sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) q_f, \quad (7)$$

where $t_{3L}(f)$ and q_f are respectively the third component of weak isospin and electric charge of fermion f ; $\hat{\rho}$ is dominated by the m_t term (cf (5)). The coefficient comes about by rewriting the tree-level formula

$$\frac{g^2(M_Z)M_Z}{8 \cos^2 \theta_W} = \frac{G_F M_Z^3}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (8)$$

Expressing the width in this way incorporates the bulk of the radiative corrections, except for the large m_t dependence in $\hat{\rho}$. Additional small radiative corrections are included but not displayed here. The factor in front incorporates the color factor and QED and QCD corrections:

$$C_f = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{3\alpha}{4\pi} q_f^2 & , \text{ leptons} \\ 3 \left(1 + \frac{3\alpha}{4\pi} q_f^2 \right) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + 1.405 \frac{\alpha_s^2}{\pi^2} \right) & , \text{ quarks} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where the range $\alpha_s(M_Z) \simeq 0.12 \pm 0.01$ from Z-decay event topologies and other data [14] is used.

(6) is written neglecting the fermion masses. In practice, fermion mass corrections [27] must be applied for $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$. They are also included in the following for $\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}$ and $\Gamma_{\tau\bar{\tau}}$, though the effects are small. There are significant correlations between the experimental values of the various total and partial Z widths, which must be included in a global analysis.

The vertex corrections for $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ depend strongly on m_t and must be included as an extra correction [34]. For fixed M_Z the $b\bar{b}$ width actually decreases with m_t , while the other modes all increase (because of the $\hat{\rho}$ factor). This gives a means of separating $\hat{\rho}(m_t)$ from such new physics as nonstandard Higgs representations by comparing $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ or Γ_Z with the other data [16].

Figure 2: Theoretical predictions for $\Gamma_Z, \Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}$, and $R = \Gamma_{had}/\Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}$ in the standard model as a function of m_t , compared with the experimental results. The M_H dependence is too small to see on the scale of the graph. The QCD uncertainties in Γ_Z and R are indicated.

The standard model predictions for $\Gamma_Z, \Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}$ ($\ell = e, \mu$, or τ), $R \equiv \Gamma_{had}/\Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}$, and the invisible width Γ_{inv} as a function of m_t are compared with the experimental results in Figures 2 and 3. ($\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ in v_f is obtained from M_Z). One sees that the agreement is excellent for m_t in the 100 – 200 GeV range. The results of fits to the Z widths are listed in Tables 4 and 5. The R ratio, which is insensitive to m_t , is slightly above the standard model prediction, though only at the 1σ level. As will be discussed, R favors a slightly higher value of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ than the value obtained from event topologies and low energy data.

The invisible width in Figure 3 is clearly in agreement with $N_\nu = 3$ but not $N_\nu = 4$. In fact, the result [3] $N_\nu = 3.004 \pm 0.035$ not only eliminates extra fermion families with $m_\nu \ll M_Z/2$, but also supersymmetric models with light sneutrinos ($\Delta N_\nu = 0.5$) and models with triplet ($\Delta N_\nu = 2$) or doublet ($\Delta N_\nu = 0.5$) Majorons [35]. N_ν does not include sterile (SU_2 -singlet) neutrinos. However, the complementary bound $N'_\nu < 3.3$ (95% CL) from nucleosynthesis [36] *does* include sterile neutrinos for a wide range of masses and mixings, provided their mass is less than ~ 20 MeV.

One can obtain precise ($\Delta = O(\pm 0.0007)$) values of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ from Γ_Z and $\Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}$ (Table 4). The major sensitivity is through the M_Z^3 factor in (6) rather than from the vertices (*i.e.*, the v_f). It is useful to also obtain the $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ from the vertices. Values can be obtained from the “reduced widths” $\Gamma_Z/M_Z^3, \Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}/M_Z^3$, and R . As can be seen in Table 4, the $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ sensitivity from Γ_Z/M_Z^3 and the combination $(\Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}/M_Z^3, R)$ is around ± 0.004 ($\Gamma_{\ell+\ell-}/M_Z^3$ and R individually give large asymmetric errors). Yet another determination of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ comes from Γ_Z/M_Z and Γ_{l+l-}/M_Z . As can be seen in Table 4 the values obtained are insensitive to m_t . This can be understood from (4) and (6), from which one sees that $\Gamma_{f\bar{f}}/M_Z$ has no quadratic m_t dependence (except $f = b$). Of course, the various values of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W$ obtained from the Γ ’s are not all independent.

Figure 3: Theoretical prediction for Γ_{inv} in the standard model with $N_\nu = 3$ and 4, compared with the experimental value.

At tree level the asymmetries can be written

$$A_{FB}(f) \simeq 3\eta_e\eta_f, \quad (10)$$

and

$$A_{pol}(\tau) \simeq 2\eta_\tau, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\eta_f \equiv \frac{v_f a_f}{v_f^2 + a_f^2}, \quad (12)$$

and v_f and a_f are the tree-level vector and axial couplings in (7). These expressions are an excellent first approximation even in the presence of higher-order corrections, provided that v_f is expressed in terms of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$, *i.e.*, one identifies v_f and a_f with the effective Born couplings $\bar{g}_V$ and $\bar{g}_A$. $A_{FB}(b) = 0.093 \pm 0.012$ has been corrected for $b\bar{b}$ oscillations [1], using

$$A_{FB}(b) = \frac{A_{FB}^{obs}(f)}{1 - 2\chi}, \quad (13)$$

where $\chi = 0.126 \pm 0.012$ is the oscillation probability at the Z -pole. $Zb\bar{b}$ vertex corrections can be added to $A_{FB}(b)$ but are negligible numerically. The predictions for $A_{FB}(\mu)$, $A_{pol}(\tau)$, and $A_{FB}(b)$ are compared with the experimental data in Figure 4. Again, the agreement is excellent.

The results for $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W$ obtained from a variety of low energy neutral current processes are listed in Table 4. The values obtained from atomic parity violation, $e^\uparrow D$, and νe and νp elastic scattering are consistent with the value obtained from M_Z . They all have a similar dependence on m_t as the M_Z value and therefore do not significantly constrain m_t . They are, however, quite important in searches for new physics.

On the other hand, the value of the on-shell $\sin^2 \theta_W$ obtained from deep inelastic νN scattering [37] is insensitive to m_t . As can be seen in Table 4 and Figure 1 the

Figure 4: Theoretical prediction for $A_{FB}(\mu)$, $A_{pol}(\tau)$, and $A_{FB}(b)$ in the standard model as a function of m_t for $M_H = 60$ (dotted line), 300 (solid), and 1000 (dashed) GeV, compared with the experimental values. The theoretical uncertainties from $\Delta\Delta r = \pm 0.0009$ are also indicated.

corresponding $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ increases rapidly with m_t . From Table 5 deep inelastic νN scattering (combined with M_Z) gives $m_t < 210(223)$ GeV at 90(95)% CL. These are somewhat weaker than previous limits (193 (207) GeV) [15] due to the inclusion of the new CCFR result [10], with its slightly lower value for $\sin^2 \theta_W$ (+6 GeV) and due to the inclusion of $O(\alpha\alpha_s m_t^2)$ radiative corrections (+11 GeV).

The results of global fits to all data are shown in Tables 4 and 5. All results include full statistical and systematic uncertainties in the experimental data as well as all of the important correlations. In particular, one obtains the prediction⁴

$$m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19+15} \text{ GeV}, \quad (14)$$

where the central value assumes $M_H = 300$ GeV. The second error is from the Higgs mass, assuming $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1000 \text{ GeV}$. The m_t and M_H dependences are strongly correlated. The relation between the two in the radiative corrections is not universal, but a reasonable interpolation of the M_H dependence is

$$m_t(\text{GeV}) = 150_{-24}^{+19} + 12.5 \ln(M_H/300\text{GeV}). \quad (15)$$

Alternately, we can allow M_H to be a free parameter in the range 60 -1000 GeV, with the result that $m_t = 131_{-28}^{+47}$ GeV, with the lower central value occurring because the best fit is for $M_H = 60$ GeV.

The upper limit on m_t is

$$m_t < \begin{cases} 190 \text{ GeV,} & 90\% & CL \\ 197 \text{ GeV,} & 95\% & CL \\ 208 \text{ GeV,} & 99\% & CL \end{cases}, \quad (16)$$

⁴This is in excellent agreement with the result 148_{-20}^{+18+17} of Schaile [3].

Figure 5: Best fit value for m_t and upper and lower limits as a function of M_H . The direct lower limit $M_H > 60$ GeV [13] and the approximate triviality limit [38] $M_H < 600$ GeV are also indicated. The latter becomes $M_H < 200$ GeV if one requires that the standard model holds up to the Planck scale.

which occurs for $M_H = 1000$ GeV. For $M_H = 60(300)$ GeV, the 90% CL limit is 158 (175) GeV and the 95% CL limit is 165 (182) GeV. The upper and lower limits on m_t are shown as a function of M_H in Figure 5. The values of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W$ and m_t and the m_t limits for various subsets of the data are given in Table 5. The χ^2 distribution as a function of m_t is shown in Figure 6 for $M_H = 60, M_Z, 300$, and 1000 GeV. The fit is excellent⁵, with a χ^2/df of $168/206 \sim 0.82$ for $m_t = 150$, $M_H = 300$ GeV.

The result in (14) is very close to the value $149_{-27}^{+21} \pm 16$ obtained about 1 year ago. The agreement is somewhat fortuitous: the new 1991 LEP and other data lower the prediction by ~ 9 GeV, but this is compensated by the inclusion of $O(\alpha\alpha_s m_t^2)$ radiative corrections (+8 GeV) and the use of 300 (rather than 250) GeV as the central M_H value (+2 GeV).

The prediction in (14) is for the minimal standard model. In the minimal supersymmetric extension (MSSM), for almost all of the allowed parameter range for the superpartner spectrum the only significant effect on the analysis is in the Higgs sector [39]. There is a light ($M < 150$ GeV) scalar which acts like a light standard model Higgs (as far as radiative corrections are concerned), and (typically) the other Higgs particles and superpartners do not contribute significantly. Thus, for the MSSM we will take $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 150 \text{ GeV}$ with a central of M_Z , yielding:

$$\text{MSSM : } \quad m_t = 134_{-28}^{+23} \pm 5 \text{ GeV.} \quad (17)$$

For M_H a free parameter in the range 60 -150 GeV, one obtains $m_t = 131_{-28}^{+31}$ GeV, with the best fit for $M_H = 60$ GeV.

⁵In fact, the fit is *too* good. This has always been the case for precision neutral current and Z-pole experiments [11]. The most likely explanation is a tendency for experimenters to overestimate systematic errors.

Figure 6: χ^2 distribution for all data (207 df) in the standard model as a function of m_t , for $M_H = 60, M_Z, 300$, and 1000 GeV. The direct constraint $m_t > 91$ GeV is *not* included.

Figure 7: 68 and 90% CL M_H ranges that could be obtained from present data if m_t were known by direct measurement to ± 10 GeV as a function of the central value of m_t .

The data also yield an indirect *lower* limit on m_t (Figure 1). For $M_H = 60$ GeV one obtains $m_t > 95(83)$ GeV at 90(95)% CL. The corresponding limits are 118(108) GeV for $M_H = 300$ GeV and 138(129) GeV for $M_H = 1000$ GeV. The lower bound is comparable to the direct CDF limit $m_t > 91$ GeV (95% CL) [12]. However, it is more general in that it applies even for nonstandard t decay modes, for which the direct lower limit is ~ 60 GeV.

The data will not significantly constrain M_H until m_t is known separately. At present the best fit occurs for lower values of M_H , but the change in χ^2 between $M_H = 60$ and 1000 GeV is only 0.6. From Figure 6 it is obvious that if m_t is measured directly to within 5-10 GeV it may be possible to constrain M_H , particularly if m_t is in the lower part of the allowed range. This is further illustrated in Figure 7, in which are displayed the 68 and 90% CL M_H ranges that could be obtained from present data if m_t were known to 10 GeV.

Figure 8: $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ obtained from various observables assuming $m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19}$ GeV, $60 < M_H < 1000$ GeV.

Assuming the standard model, one therefore concludes $91 \text{ GeV} < m_t < 197 \text{ GeV}$ at 95% CL. In most cases, the effect of new physics is to *strengthen* the upper bound rather than weaken it. The obvious question is, why is m_t so large (or why are the other fermion masses so small)? Note that the value of m_t considered here is the position of the pole in the t propagator (not the running mass). It should coincide (with a theoretical ambiguity of $\sim 5 \text{ GeV}$) with the kinematic mass relevant for the production of the t quark at hadron colliders.

For the weak angle one obtains (in the standard model)

$$\begin{aligned} \sin^2 \theta_W &= 0.2267 \pm 0.0024 \\ \sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) &= 0.2328 \pm 0.0007, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the uncertainty is mainly from m_t . The small uncertainty from M_H in the range 60 - 1000 GeV is included in the errors in (18). The corresponding value in the MSSM is $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) = 0.2326 \pm 0.0006$. Of course, $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ is much less sensitive to m_t and M_H than $\sin^2 \theta_W$. All of the values obtained from individual observables are in excellent agreement with (18). In particular, the $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W$ values obtained assuming $m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19}$ GeV and $60 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 1000 \text{ GeV}$ are shown in Table 4 and in Figure 8. The agreement is remarkable.

One can also extract the radiative correction parameter Δr (eqn. (4)). One finds

$$\Delta r = 0.049 \pm 0.008 \tag{19}$$

compared to the expectation $0.0626 \pm 0.0009(0.0273)$ for $m_t = 100(200)$, $M_H = 300$. Similarly, in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, one finds

$$\Delta \hat{r}_W = 0.069 \pm 0.006, \tag{20}$$

compared with the expectation $0.0696 \pm 0.0009(0.0723)$.

$\alpha_s(M_Z)$	source
0.130 ± 0.009	precision Z -pole and low energy
0.135 ± 0.011	$M_Z, \Gamma_Z, R, \sigma_p^h, \Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$
0.123 ± 0.005	event topologies [14]
0.118 ± 0.005	τ decays [14]
0.112 ± 0.005	deep inelastic scattering (DIS) [14]
0.113 ± 0.006	$\Upsilon, J/\psi$ [14]
0.12 ± 0.01	event topologies, τ , DIS, $\Upsilon, J/\psi$
0.126 ± 0.007	combined

Table 6: Values of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ from indirect precision data, event topologies, low energy data, and all data.

The hadronic Z width depends on the value of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$. The quoted results use the value 0.12 ± 0.01 obtained from Z -decay event topologies and low energy data [14]. One can also obtain a value of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ from the hadronic widths, and in particular from R , which is insensitive to m_t . A fit to all Z -pole and other data (but not including the constraint $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$) to $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$, and m_t yields $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.130 \pm 0.009$, which is consistent but slightly above the other determinations. From $M_Z, \Gamma_Z, R, \sigma_p^h$, and $\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}$ only, one finds the higher value 0.135 ± 0.011 . When $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ is included as a separate constraint in the fit to all data one obtains the average $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.126 \pm 0.007$. These values are listed in Table 6, along with the most important low energy determinations [14]. There is a slight tendency for higher values from the Z -pole data, but given the uncertainties (which are usually dominated by theoretical errors) there is no real discrepancy.

The value of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ from the precision experiments is strongly anticorrelated with m_t , as can be seen in Figure 9. In particular, larger m_t corresponds to smaller $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, in better agreement with the low energy data.

3 Implications for Grand Unification

These results are in excellent agreement with the predictions of grand unification in the minimal supersymmetric extension of the (MSSM), but not in the simplest (and most predictive) non-supersymmetric GUT (SM) [41]. In particular, using $\alpha^{-1}(M_Z) = 127.9 \pm 0.2$ and $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ one predicts

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) &= 0.2334 \pm 0.0025 \pm 0.0025 \text{ (MSSM)}, \\
\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) &= 0.2100 \pm 0.0025 \pm 0.0007 \text{ (SM)},
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the first uncertainty is from α_s and α^{-1} , and the second is an estimate of theoretical uncertainties from the superspectrum, high-scale thresholds, and possible

Figure 9: 90% CL allowed region in $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ and m_t from a combined fit to precision Z -pole and other data (but not including event topology and low energy determinations of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$).

non-renormalizable operators [19]. The MSSM prediction is in excellent agreement with the experimental value 0.2326 ± 0.0006 , while the SM prediction is in conflict with the data. Because of the large uncertainty in $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, it is convenient to invert the logic and use the precisely known α^{-1} and $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ to predict $\alpha_s(M_Z)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.125 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.009 \text{ (MSSM)}, \\ \alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.072 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.001 \text{ (SM)},\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

where again the second error is theoretical. It is seen that the SUSY case is in excellent agreement with the experimental $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.12 \pm 0.01$, while the simplest ordinary GUTs are excluded (this is completely independent of proton decay). The unification slightly prefers larger values of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, as suggested by the Z -pole data, but the theoretical uncertainties are comparable to the error on the observed $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ (which is also dominated by theory). Proton decay is strongly suppressed in SUSY-GUTs. Perhaps, the coupling constants will indeed prove to be the “first harbinger of supersymmetry” [42].

4 Conclusions

- There is no evidence for any deviation from the standard model.
- $\overline{\text{MS}}$: $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z) = 0.2328 \pm 0.0007$
- On-shell: $\sin^2 \theta_W \equiv 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2 = 0.2267 \pm 0.0024$, where the uncertainties are mainly from m_t .
- In the standard model one predicts: $m_t = 150_{-24}^{+19+15}$ GeV, where the central value assumes $M_H = 300$ GeV and the second uncertainty is for $M_H \rightarrow 60$ GeV (−) or 1 TeV (+).

- In the MSSM $m_t = 134^{+23}_{-28} \pm 5$ GeV, where the difference is due the light Higgs scalar expected in the MSSM.
- Precision data yield the 95% CL constraints

$$83 \text{ GeV} < m_t < 197 \text{ GeV}, \quad (23)$$

where the lower (upper) limits are for $M_H = 60$ (1000) GeV. The lower limit is valid for any decay mode, and is to be compared with the direct CDF limit $m_t > 91$ GeV, which assumes canonical decays.

- There is no significant constraint on M_H until m_t is known independently.
- Precision Z -pole and low-energy data yield the indirect result $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.130 \pm 0.009$, in reasonable agreement with the value 0.12 ± 0.01 obtained from jet event topologies and low energy direct determinations.
- The low energy couplings are in excellent agreement with the predictions of supersymmetric grand unification, but not with the simplest (and most predictive) non-supersymmetric grand unified theories.
- The precision data place stringent limits on many types of new physics into the TeV range.
- In the future, precision electroweak experiments will be a useful complement to high energy colliders.

References

- [1] For a recent review, see L. Rolandi, *XXVI ICHEP 1992*, Dallas, August 1992, CERN-PPE/92-175.
- [2] The LEP Collaborations, Phys. Lett. **B276**, 247 (1992).
- [3] D. Schaile, to be published in *Precision Tests of the Standard Electroweak Model*, (World, Singapore, 1993), ed. P. Langacker.
- [4] SLD: B. A. Schumm *et al.*, 1992 DPF meeting, SLAC-PUB-5995.
- [5] CDF: F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2243 (1990).
- [6] UA2: J. Alitti *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B276**, 354 (1992). See also H. Plathow-Besch, *Lepton Photon and High Energy Physics Conference (LP-HEP 91)*, Geneva, July, 1991.
- [7] Cesium: M. C. Noecker *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 310 (1988).

- [8] Atomic theory: S.A. Blundell, W.R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1411 (1990); V. A. Dzuba *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **141A**, 147 (1989).
- [9] CHARM II: D. Geiregat *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B259**, 499 (1991); S. Cocco, *XXVIIth Rencontres de Moriond*, March 1992.
- [10] T. Bolton, *XXVIIth Rencontres de Moriond*, March 1992.
- [11] For recent reviews, see U. Amaldi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 1385 (1987); P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 817 (1991); P. Langacker, in *TeV Physics*, ed. T. Huang *et al.*, (Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia, 1991), p. 53; *Review of Particle Properties*, Phys. Rev. **D45**, III-59,VII-159 (1992).
- [12] CDF: F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 664 (1991).
- [13] T. Mori, *XXVI ICHEP 1992*, Dallas, August 1992.
- [14] This is an approximate range based on the data reviewed in S. Bethke and S. Catani, CERN TH.6484/92, and T. Hebbeker, LP-HEP 91 (Aachen PITHA 91/17).
- [15] P. Langacker, in *Electroweak Physics Beyond the Standard Model*, ed. J. W. F. Valle and J. Velasco (World, Singapore, 1991), p. 75. and [11].
- [16] P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 817 (1991).
- [17] P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 278 (1992).
- [18] D. Kennedy and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2967 (1990); Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1591 (1991).
- [19] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, UPR-0513T.
- [20] CDHS: H. Abramowicz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 298 (1986), A. Blondel *et al.*, Zeit. Phys. **C45**, 361 (1990).
- [21] CHARM: J. V. Allaby *et al.*, Zeit. Phys. **C36**, 611 (1987).
- [22] Earlier indirect arguments for the existence of the t quark are summarized in P. Langacker, Comm. Nucl. Part. Sci. **19**, 1 (1989).
- [23] D. Schaile and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 3262 (1992).
- [24] A. Sirlin, Phys. Lett. **B232**, 123 (1989); S. Fanchiotti and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 319 (1990); A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B332**, 20 (1990), and references therein.
- [25] A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 971 (1980); **D29**, 89 (1984); W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2695 (1980).

- [26] G. Degrossi, S. Fanchiotti and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B351**, 49 (1991).
- [27] W. Hollik, Fortsch Phys. **38**, 165 (1990).
- [28] *ZFITTER*, D. Bardin *et al.*, CERN-TH-6443-92.
- [29] G. Degrossi and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B352**, 342 (1991).
- [30] M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. **B123**, 89 (1977); M. Chanowitz, M. A. Furman, and I. Hinchliffe, Phys. Lett. **B78**, 285 (1978).
- [31] A. Djouadi and C. Verzegnassi, Phys. Lett. **B195**, 265 (1987); A. Djouadi, Nuovo Cim. **100A**, 357 (1988).
- [32] B. A. Kniehl, J. H. Kühn, and R. G. Stuart, Phys. Lett. **B214**, 621 (1988); B. A. Kniehl and J. H. Kühn, Nucl. Phys. **B329**, 547 (1990); B. A. Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. **B347**, 86 (1990); F. Halzen and B. A. Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. **B353**, 567 (1991); B. A. Kniehl and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B371**, 141 (1992).
- [33] S. Fanchiotti, B. Kniehl, and A. Sirlin, CERN-TH.6749/92.
- [34] W. Beenakker and W. Hollik, Z. Phys. **C40**, 141 (1988); A. A. Akhundov *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B276**, 1 (1986); J. Bernabeu, A. Pich, and A. Santamaria, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 326 (1991).
- [35] For a review, see P. Langacker, in *Testing the Standard Model*, ed. M. Cvetič and P. Langacker (World, Singapore, 1991), p. 863.
- [36] K. A. Olive *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B236**, 454 (1990); T. P. Walker *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **376**, 51 (1991).
- [37] Theoretical uncertainties are discussed in [11].
- [38] For a review, see J. F. Gunion *et al.*, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide* (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1990).
- [39] R. Barbieri *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B341**, 309 (1990); J. Ellis, G. L. Fogli, and E. Lisi, CERN TH-6643-92.
- [40] J. L. Rosner, EFI 92-58.
- [41] P. Langacker and M. Luo, [16]; U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. **B260**, 447 (1991). J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B249**, 441 (1990). F. Anselmo, L. Cifarelli, A. Peterman, and A. Zichichi, Nuo. Cim. **104A**, 1817 (1991); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, [19].
- [42] U. Amaldi *et al.*, [11].